A REVIEW

OF THE

Doctrine of Endless Misery.

BY HOSEA BALLOU.

A

REVIEW

OF

SOME OF PROFESSOR STUART'S ARGUMENTS

IN DEFENCE OF

Endless Misery,

PUBLISHED IN THE AMERICAN BIBLICAL REPOSITORY, JULY 1840.

BY HOSEA BALLOU,

PASTOR OF THE SECOND UNIVERSALIST SOCIETY IN BOSTON.

BOSTON:

A. TOMPKINS, 38 CORNHILL.

1840.

J. N. BANG, PR. 40 CORNHILL.

PREFACE.

THAT Professor Stuart is right, in that he allows the subject of the endless duration of punishment to be one of the deepest interest to mankind, and one too which is calculated, more than any other, to agitate the minds of reflecting men, and to put to the most severe trials the very best sympathies of our nature, no reasonable person will deny.

As he is a conscientious believer in this most fearful doctrine, and as he evidently believes, that the eternal well-being of immortal souls depends on a sound belief of it; and knowing that there are many serious people, and even some clergymen, who by finding it impossible to reconcile the benevolent feelings, of which they are possessed, to the rigid severity of this doctrine, have been driven, not only into severe trials, but even into doubts, he has felt it his duty to exert his learning, talents, and influence, to remove such doubts, and to quiet those feelings, of the benevolent heart, which have been the cause of them.

It is thus apparent, that the very benevolence, which he would, by his arguments, overcome in others, is in himself so alive to the eternal interest of his fellow-beings, that he is willing to devote his labors for their good.

The object of the writer of the following sheets, has been to answer, though it be in a feeble manner, the demands of the same benevolence. Not believing in the truth of that most shocking doctrine, which so directly conflicts with the very best and holiest affections of the human heart, he feels an ardent desire to contribute all in his power, to disprove the truth of a doctrine, which cannot fail to agitate and deeply distress all who sincerely believe it; and which not only reflects dishonor on the character of our Father in heaven, but renders the gracious scheme of the gospel of his ever beloved Son, one of partiality.

If what the following sheets contain, should, by the blessing of God, contribute, in any degree, to the end the writer had in view, let the honor be rendered to Him, who is able to promote his merciful designs, by the use of the humblest means.

THE AUTHOR.

Boston, August 1, 1840.

Review, &c.

A REVIEW, &c.

In this humble attempt to review what the learned Professor has written, on the subject of endless punishment, I have no expectation of writing anything which he would even condescend to read, much less to answer. Nor have I much reason to expect but little, if any, more attention from others, who are confirmed in the sentiments which the Professor maintains; and yet there are reasons in my mind which seem to justify me in such an undertaking. There are, to my certain knowledge, a great multitude of people in community, who are, in my humble opinion, worthy of being attended to, who will not, as I hope, think it too great a condescension to read, with candor, what I may be enabled to offer on a subject so important. *Many of these,* I have no doubt, entertain so

high an opinion of the learning and talents of the author, whose arguments I intend to examine, that they will read what he has written, and will also avail themselves of an opportunity to learn what may be offered in reply.

As to the importance of the subject, I think it well expressed by the Professor himself, as follows: 'Next to the inquiry, whether the soul is immortal, stands, in point of importance and interest, the question, *whether there is a state of reward and punishment beyond the grave, and whether that state is eternal.*' It may be well to inquire in this place, how it so happens after ages and ages have passed away, in which the doctors of the church have embraced, in their creeds and confessions of faith, the strict eternity of punishment, as an essential article; and have made constant use of the same as a means of terror for the purpose of bringing sinners to repentance, it is, after all, a question? Is this most tremendous doctrine now a question? This doctrine which has been the *means of* converting millions of sinners, and

of keeping them in the love and fear of God, and of thereby preparing them for heaven, where they have long been at rest, a question? If it be allowed now to be a question, what becomes of all the good work which has been effected by it? Suppose the doctrine to be an error, how are we to estimate the repentances and conversions, and all the piety which have been produced by it? If a fundamental error has been the means of such infinite good; if by its influence millions of immortal souls are now in the mansions of eternal peace, if we have any good will to mankind, can we wish to have the error detected? Why not let it go on and do as much good in future as it has done in past time? Who, possessing any piety, can be willing to make a question of this subject? Who, realizing the infinite amount of good already produced by means of this doctrine, can, without trembling, hear it called in question? But the thing is already done; and our author gives it his countenance. Hear what he says: 'No reflecting man can wonder that so many among us are deeply agitated by *this subject*. . . . There are not a few

who claim to be considered as christians, whose minds are filled with difficulty in respect to the subject of endless misery in a future world; and no inconsiderable number who reject, even with scorn and contumely the idea that such a doom for the human soul is possible.'

Let us be a little careful here. Our author seems to present his readers with two classes. 1. He says, 'There are not a few who claim to be considered as christians, whose minds are filled with difficulty in respect to the subject of endless misery in the future world.' 2. He further adds, 'And no inconsiderable number who reject, even with scorn and contumely, the idea that such a doom for the human soul is possible.' As to the first class here pointed out, I have no hesitation in believing that our author is correct. They are such, no doubt, as he alludes to in his preceding remark, when he says, as above quoted, 'No reflecting man can wonder that so many among us are deeply agitated by this subject.' With many of these, *we have no reason* to doubt, he is acquaint-

ed; and to them, perhaps, he would not wholly deny their claim to be considered as christians. Now, it is on account of this class that he is brought to be willing to labor his great subject; and to allow it to be considered as a question, whether the doctrine of endless misery be true or not. If I rightly understand the Professor in this case, as I have no doubt I do, I must come to this conclusion, that he is well informed of the fact, that there are not a few whose minds are deeply agitated with the subject of endless misery, and are filled with difficulty on account of it; and moreover that he does not wonder it is so. Why not wonder? If the doctrine of endless misery be a truth, which God hath revealed in the scriptures, there seems to be something to be wondered at; and I think more things than one. Is it not a matter of wonder that the Creator, being possessed of infinite wisdom, power and goodness, should create immortal souls knowing that they must endure a never ending misery? If this doctrine be revealed in the scriptures, is it not a wonder that it should be there found in such obscurity, that after the most patient

search, it should be so obscure that not a few should find their minds filled with difficulty with regard to it? Is it no matter of wonder, that even now, after this doctrine has been so long believed by the clergy, and so long used for the purpose of fitting souls for heaven, and with such immense effect too, that it should be considered a question? But our author says, 'No reflecting man can wonder that so many among us are deeply agitated by this subject.' What has been the cause of this agitation? What would have been thought of a Professor of Theology, in the fourteenth century, who should have made the statements which we are considering? Is the Bible generally less understood now than it was then? No candid person can look at these plain questions without coming to the conclusion that the better the scriptures are understood, the more doubtful the doctrine of endless misery becomes. And I will venture to state, as my sober opinion, that the more our Professors of Divinity endeavor to remove the doubts of the many whose minds are deeply agitated with this subject, and filled with difficulties about it,

the greater will be the number for whom they will have to labor, and the more dimly will the truth of their doctrine appear.

How happens it that there are not many among us whose minds are deeply agitated with the question, whether the scriptures teach the being and perfections of God? The answer is, they are too definite on the subject to leave it in doubt. Why are there not many among us whose minds are in difficulty on the question, whether the scriptures teach that God sent his son into the world to save sinners? The answer is, this fact is so fully expressed that none can doubt it. Why are there not many among us whose minds are in difficulty on the question, whether the scriptures teach the doctrine of the resurrection and a future state? This question is answered as are the preceding. But how is it that there are so many who doubt that the scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery? Candor must answer, it is because the scriptures do not so clearly express this doctrine, as they do the other facts, above stated. But if this doctrine is to be found in

the Bible, and if it be a fundamental articl of the christian faith; if not to believe it ex poses us to never ending torments, who wil undertake to give the reason why it shoul not be as fully and as clearly expressed a any other fact?

Concerning the second class of peopl to which our author alluded, who, he says are 'no inconsiderable number, who reject even with scorn and contumely, the idea tha such a doom for the human soul is possi ble,' I have some queries to suggest. Of thi class our author again speaks thus, 'Som look scorn and breathe contempt when th doctrine of endless punishment is mentioned. Concerning this '*no inconsiderable number*, I ask, where are they? How did the learn ed Professor become acquainted with them If he speaks discreetly, he speaks from per sonal knowledge, or he would not say o them, *they look scorn and breathe contempt* In fact he does not intimate that his knowl edge of these people is from report; nor does he give us any reason to believe that his knowledge of them is obtained from reading

any thing they have written and published. My acquaintance with people of different sentiments commenced when I was quite young; my father being a clergyman of the Calvinistic creed, contributed not a little to introduce me to such an acquaintance, and it has been increasing for half a century; and yet I have never come to the knowledge of the people to whom our learned author has, without the least hesitation, given such an indecent and degraded character. I have been happily made acquainted with many who do not believe the doctrine of endless misery; and I have read a number of authors who endeavored to maintain a contrary sentiment; but I have never came to the knowledge of this class of people, *who reject, even with scorn and contumely, the idea of endless misery; and who look scorn and breathe contempt when the doctrine of endless punishment is mentioned.* But I must ask furthermore, whether our author has, in this instance, set a good example? Is it really christian like to use such language concerning *no inconsiderable number* of people, and implicate them in such a manner, and yet give his readers

no intimation who or where they are? Such terms as *scorn*, *contumely*, *looking scorn*, *and breathing contempt*, used to give a character to *no inconsiderable* number of people, might by some be thought to come very near to that of which the writer accused others. These suggestions are mere queries. Far be it from me to accuse this advocate of the doctrine of endless misery of any thing improper. I entertain no mean opinion of the goodness of his heart, as I shall have occasion to show before I get through with what I have yet to write.

As the Professor has given his readers to know that he is acquainted with two classes of people, who are not fully satisfied with the doctrine of endless misery; one of which he represents as merely doubting the truth of the doctrine, and as feeling no small concern about the subject; and the other as manifesting a scorn and contempt in regard to it, we are left to believe that he is entirely ignorant of another class, which are known to be numerous, and spread all over our happy and enlightened country, who have been deliv-

ered in their minds, from the spiritual bondage, fear and torment which that doctrine never fails to impose on all who sincerely believe it. It seems he must be ignorant of this class, because he is particular in describing the other two, but gives no intimation that he has any knowledge of any other than those he mentions, who do not fully believe in that gloomy doctrine. The class of which I am now speaking, consists of the very many who have, by carefully studying the scriptures, and by a sober and prayerful use of the reason and understanding which the Father of Spirits has given them, arrived at a full conviction of the truth, that THE LIVING GOD IS THE SAVIOR OF ALL MEN. I know not how to account for his entire ignorance of this numerous denomination of christians, as there are a great many of their houses of worship within less than twenty miles of his residence, and one within a few rods of the institution where he presides. I have an extensive acquaintance with this people, and I know that they do not belong to either of the classes which our author has so definitely described. *If* he had ever made himself ac-

quainted with this denomination, and
their many publications in defence of
sentiments, he would better have kr
what he had to do to support the doctri
endless misery. But so entirely ignora
he of this people and of their writings,
he makes no mention of a single book, or
sage in a book which they have publi

Our author makes the following staten
the amount of which I will not undertal
say how many times I have heard state
different persons, who meant thereby to j
fy themselves in rejecting even scriptur
gument, in favor of the salvation of all
It is no matter of wonder to me when I
ignorant bigots make this and similar d
rations; but it is with surprise that I
from the pen of a Professor of Theolog
acknowledged learning and talents, as
lows: 'I can never think on the subje
future punishment without spontaneo
asking, Why should I disbelieve it?
be true that there is no punishment for
wicked hereafter, then I shall be as mu
partaker of all the good which is to com

if I were a believer in the doctrine of those who affirm this!' One thing which seems remarkable in this statement is, that it supposes that the belief or disbelief of a doctrine is at the disposal of the writer's will. He certainly indicates this; and also, that *he can never think on* the great question which he considers, without calling in question the probable amount of loss and gain to him, which might accrue from believing or disbelieving a certain proposition. He says he *can never think* of this subject *without spontaneously asking, &c.* If this is the condition of his mind, and if his belief is subject to his will, who can greatly wonder that, notwithstanding the abundant declarations of the scriptures to the contrary, he believes in the doctrine of endless misery? If he thinks there is more to gain by still continuing to believe as he does than by embracing a contrary belief, though he may misreckon, he will continue on, and believe as he does. Notwithstanding his will can easily manage his belief, it cannot assist him to avoid *spontaneously* asking, &c. He says, 'I can never

think on the subject of future punishment without spontaneously asking, &c.' In this situation, having no power to avoid the question, and being compelled to make the reckoning, yet being fully able to manage his belief as he wills, who can wonder that he remains a believer in endless misery? The case would have been widely different if he had ever believed the heavenly doctrine of God's impartial and efficient grace, and had drank of those sweet waters, one single drop of which is worth an ocean of those on whose perturbed waves float the gallant ships, constructed by the worldly wisdom of those *who receive honor one of another, and seek not that honor which cometh from God only.* If Saul, the scholar of Gamaliel, had been asked the question, whether he would be willing to renounce the popular doctrine of the Pharisees and embrace the faith of Jesus, no doubt he would have rejected the proposal; but if Paul, the Apostle of Christ, had been asked whether he would be willing to renounce his faith in the Savior of the world, and embrace the doctrine of the Pharisees, he would rather

have been nailed to the cross of his Master than to have accepted the offer, even if it were in the power of his will to accept it.

If our author's mind is in the condition which his declaration above noticed indicates, it does not appear even possible for him to weigh impartially the evidences for and against the doctrine, which is the subject on which he writes. I will not say, for I do not know, that he has done himself justice in that declaration; of this he must be the judge. But I have little or no doubt that he has done injustice to those of whom he speaks. In that declaration he speaks of those *who affirm that there is no punishment for the wicked hereafter.* Who are those that thus *affirm?* Our author gives us to understand that he knows people, and no inconsiderable number too, who look scorn and breathe contempt when mention is made of endless punishment. Is it any of those who affirm that the wicked will not be punished hereafter? Who, besides him, is acquainted with such people? In all my intercourse with community, I *never have* found this people; in all I ever

read, I never met with such an affirmation. If there are any wicked in the future world, will any one doubt of their being punished as long as they are wicked? I do not believe there is a person in the world who even doubts this. Nor do I believe that our author or any body else, knows of any who *affirm* that wickedness and punishment may not there exist. If any one should *affirm* either this or the contrary, would they not *affirm* what they do not know? I presume that our author believes that both sin and punishment will be known in the future world; but I do not believe that he would *affirm* that it will be so. I enjoy the hope that it will not; but I would not *affirm* that it will not. If the future state is a state of sin and wickedness, and of consequent misery, I am free to confess that I find in the scriptures no information of the fact.

Having noticed some statements made by our author, I propose to examine some of his arguments in favor of endless misery. The following are his words: 'There is a fearful *looking for of* judgment and firy indignation

which will devour the adversaries, implanted by our Maker in the human breast, in order to proclaim within us that there is a God who will judge the world in righteousness, who abhors sin and loves holiness, and who will exhibit to the creatures of his power his love of the one and his hatred of the other. Conscience can be stilled in respect to these fears only by doing to her the most absolute violence, binding her in chains, hoodwinking her, or administering opiates in large quantities. This is the most usual method of keeping her quiet. Conscience whispers with an accent that penetrates the inmost recesses of the soul: "There is a God who judgeth the earth."' In reference to what is here quoted, I would first inquire, whether the simple fact that man is possessed of a consciousness of right and wrong, and of the fact that right must meet the approbation of God, and that sin will be visited with a just retribution, is any proof that the doctrine of endless misery is true? For myself I must say, that I can see no relation between such premises and such a conclusion. If such a relation does *exist*, it is fair to conclude that every

soul who has committed sin, must be endlessly miserable. If there be any possible way for one soul who has sinned, to escape this endless misery, and I have no reason to doubt that our author believes there is, then what he has to prove is, that those means by which some sinners may escape this endless misery, are not sufficient to save all who have sinned from the same. Why does he overlook or neglect to notice this most important and manifest fact? Such neglect certainly indicates that to make a display of terror, of horror, and to awaken apprehensions, was more his object, than to lead the minds of his readers to a correct understanding of the merits of his subject. I do not say that this was his motive; but I do say that I regret that he gives such clear indications that it was. And I am moreover, sorry to say, that what I have noticed is not the strongest indication of what, I hope most sincerely is not true. He says, as before quoted, 'Conscience whispers with an accent that penetrates the inmost recesses of the soul: 'There is a God who judgeth the earth.' This last sentence *he marks as* a scripture quotation. I can find

no such passage in the Bible. He evidently intended that his readers should believe it was the word of God; and I hope he believed it was. There is a passage in the lxviii. Psalm, which reads thus: 'Verily there is a reward for the righteous; verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth.' If our author had quoted this passage correctly he would then have presented to his readers divine authority to prove, that it is *in* the earth where God both judgeth and rewardeth: and this is believed to be the sense of every passage of holy writ which treats on the subject. If this advocate of the doctrine of endless misery would not have his readers believe that he would wrongly quote scripture to favor his cause, it appears that he was not so cautious as prudence would dictate. It is not certain that all his readers can be so ignorant of the Bible as not to know when it is rightly quoted and when it is not; nor is it certain that all will be as charitable as they ought to be towards a learned writer who quotes it incorrectly, when a correct quotation would disprove what the writer was endeavoring to support. Our author makes very solemn

appeals to conscience. Has conscience nothing to do but with what relates to endless punishment? Or if it has, may we, with impunity, still its voice with large quantities of opiates?

Again, I quote from our author, 'There the assurance is given, that when the Savior is seated on his throne of final judgment, and all nations are assembled before him, he will separate them as a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats, to the one he will assign ζωην αιωνιον, to the other κολασιν αἰωνιον. The punishment is characterized by the same adjective as the reward; and if the life be endless in this case, then the *punishment* must also be endless. With such an avowal as this before us, from the lips of him who is himself to be our final judge, is it acting a reasonable part to shut our eyes against it, and in accordance with our wishes, maintain that even the Bible itself establishes the doctrine of universal salvation, or at least of universal restoration?' Here our author alludes to the last paragraph of Mat. xxv. I ask in *the first* place, why he ventures to call the

judgment there represented, the *final* judgment? By the word *final* he doubtless means the *last*. But I ask the sober question, why he ventures to assert what no man living can prove? Merely because it suits his convenience does he feel authorized to make a bold assertion of what he has not even the shadow of evidence to prove? Is this the right way to treat the holy scriptures? or is it the best way to convince men of what he thinks is error? In room of being convinced by such presumption, for it deserves no softer term, I should sooner believe that he had no confidence himself in what he affirms. But I will not allow that he intended to assert what he did not believe. But in order to avoid this I am compelled to believe that he is most grossly blinded by the power of traditional error. There is not a word in all the connection of the passage to which he alludes, that authorizes him to assert that the judgment spoken of is the final or last judgment. But the contrary of this is apparent from the whole discourse in which the passage is found, as every candid mind must allow *on reading* it. Whoever will examine

this discourse, which Jesus delivered on the Mount of Olives to his disciples, will find that he spake of no time nor judgment later than the destruction of Jerusalem by their enemies, which he said should be fulfilled in that generation. I ask in the second place, by what authority the judgment here described can be carried into the future state? It is believed by all who contend for a judgment hereafter, or in the future state, that all the dead will be raised in order to come to that judgment; and yet we read not a word in all this discourse of the resurrection of a single individual. There is nothing said about a resurrection. I ask in the third place, how it happens that the learned Professor, while laboring for the professed purpose of refuting Universalists, should bring this passage against their belief, and yet take no notice of their views of it? Is he entirely ignorant of the way in which they understand it? By Universalists this passage has been explained over and over again; I will not say how many times, nor in how many of their publications. Is he ignorant of this *fact? If he* is, he has much to learn before

he can do anything which will assist them out of their error, if they are in one. If he is not ignorant on this subject, then have Universalists good reason to believe that he feels himself to be incompetent to answer them. For what purpose then does he labor? Let him give the answer.

When we read the New Testament, we wonder and are astonished at the stupidity of the enemies of Jesus, and their blindness. Their leaders were men of profound learning, and as conversant with the scriptures of Moses and the prophets as are our doctors of divinity with our Bible; and yet, notwithstanding all their familiarity with their scriptures, they did not understand even those parts which were the most plain and easy for common sense to discern. Yet they esteemed themselves profoundly wise and knowing; and if we should undertake to describe their feelings toward the common people, and their treatment of them when they ventured to offer an opinion different from theirs, or to believe anything different from what they believed and taught, it

ould be convenient to borrow the words hich our author used when describing the onduct of *no inconsiderable* number of people, when they hear of the doctrine of endless punishment; for these learned doctors and scribes did actually *look scorn and breathe contempt*, when the humble man to whom Jesus gave sight ventured to speak to them in commendation of his benefactor. 'They answered and said unto him, thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us? and they cast him out.' When these learned rulers sent officers to arrest Jesus and they returned without him, they asked them why they had not brought him. 'Th officers answered, Never man spake like th man. Then answered them the Pharisee Are ye, also, deceived? have any of t rulers, or of the Pharisees, believed on hi But this people, who knoweth not the l are cursed.' This was *looking scorn breathing contempt*, and in this langu there is *contumely*. In those times the le ed *doctors* could *look scorn and breathe tempt*, and use contumelious language. *withstanding* we have reason to mar

the ignorance of the learned Jews, and to wonder that they should not have better understood their scriptures. We have, in our times, those who, if possible, outdo them. Our doctors of divinity profess to know the scriptures, and to be able to teach the people their true meaning; and yet they do not understand even those parts of them where it seems the most pains were taken to make their subjects the most plain. There are a number of passages which speak of the coming of Christ to judge and to reward men according to their works; and it seems that care was specially taken to fix the time of this judgment so definitely that no mistake need be made. When Jesus spake on this subject it was generally to his disciples, and he was careful to certify them that some of them should live to see that day. And here let me remark that Jesus never spake of his coming to judge and reward men, at any later time. See Matt. xvi. 27, 28. 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I *say unto* you there be some standing *here which shall* not taste of death till they

see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.' Mark viii. 38; ix. 1. 'Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me, and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with his holy angels. And he said unto them, verily I say unto you, that there be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.' Luke ix. 26, 27. 'For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed when he shall come in his own glory and in his Father's, and of the holy angels. But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God.' See also what Jesus said to his enemies in Jerusalem, recorded Matt. xxiii. 34—36. 'Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men and scribes, and some of them shall ye kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city; that upon you may *come all the* righteous blood shed upon the *earth, from* the blood of righteous Abel unt

the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily, I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation.' See also Matt. xxiv. 30—35. 'And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. Now learn a parable of the fig tree: When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh; so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away.' In this self same discourse is found the judgment described, to which our author alludes, and which he confidently affirms is the final judgment! And yet it is introduced in the use of the same descriptions as we find in those passages before ci

ted. Our doctors of divinity and our learned author with them, contend that this judgment has not yet taken place! In direct and open violation of the solemn and plain declarations of the Son of God, they affirm that this judgment has not yet been accomplished! Did the blindness of the learned enemies of Jesus exceed this? Our author with great gravity, after giving his readers his affirmation that this judgment is the final or last judgment, sternly asks the following question, which has been before quoted, 'With such an avowal as this before us, from the lips of him who is himself to be our final judge, is it acting a reasonable part to shut our eyes against it, and in accordance with our wishes, maintain that even the Bible itself establishes the doctrine of universal salvation, or at least of ultimate universal restoration?' If shutting our eyes against the declarations of Jesus, is acting an unreasonable part, how very unreasonable is the conduct of our author in so shutting his eyes as to violate every declaration which Jesus made on the subject of the time of this judgment. I would no sooner call his learning or his sincerity in question, than I would the learning and sincerity of the

enemies of Jesus. The things which belonged to their peace were hidden from their eyes; and so, I believe, are the things which belong to his peace hidden from his eyes. He has presented his readers with the Greek words, which in the passage under consideration, are rendered everlasting punishment and eternal life, and truly says, that the Greek adjective is the same in both cases. And from this fact he affirms, that if the life in this case be endless, the punishment must also be endless. Now all this is predicated on his error in supposing that the judgment of which Jesus was speaking did not take place at the time when he said it would, but is to take place hereafter, when all the dead shall be raised, and this natural world shall have sunk to utter dissolution. If the reader will examine the whole discourse of the Savior, in which a description of this judgment is recorded, and the other passages also, before quoted, which all relate to the same time and events, he will see that not a word is said about the dissolution of the material world, in which we live, nor of the resurrection of the dead. This judgment, therefore, can by no fair construction be carried into the future state, or

understood as having reference to man's
istence, or to rewards and punishment
that state.

There appears no good reason for ca
ing either the everlasting punishment or
life eternal, mentioned in this passage, i
the future state. Jesus said, John xvi
'And this is life eternal, that they might kn
thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ wh
thou hast sent.' The everlasting punishm
mentioned in the text, no doubt, meant
enduring age, in which the Jews, who pe
cuted Jesus and his disciples even unto de
would suffer the severe chastisements wh
divine justice appointed; and which we kn
have fallen upon them; and the eternal
spoken of in the text, no doubt, is that go
life, which is enjoyed in the enduring ag
the gospel kingdom of Jesus here on ea
It may be proper here to remark, that in th
passages which speak of judging and rew
ing men according to their works, not
is said of their resurrection from the de
and in those passages which speak of
resurrection, no mention is made of a ju
ment, or of rewards and punishments

this remark I would have it understood that passages which speak *figuratively* of men being raised from the dead, are not included.

I did not intend to say more than I have on the subject of Christ's coming to judge and reward men according to their works; but what Dr. A. Clarke, a believer in endless punishment has written on Matt. xvi. 28, is so very appropriate, and in such agreement with my views, I am disposed to quote it. He says, 'This verse seems to confirm the above explanation, as our Lord evidently speaks of the establishment of the christian church after the day of pentecost, and its final triumph after the destruction of the Jewish polity; as if he had said, "some of you, my disciples, shall continue to live until these things shall take place." The destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish economy, which our Lord here predicts, took place about forty-three years after this, and some of the persons now with him, doubtless survived that period, and witnessed the extension of the Messiah's kingdom; and our Lord told them of *these things* before, that when they came *to pass*, they might be confirmed in the faith

and expect an exact fulfilment of all the other promises and prophecies which concerned the extension and support of the kingdom of Christ.

As the learned Professor seems to depend as much on the judgment described by Jesus in his discourse, in which he prophetically spake to his disciples concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, as he does on any passage in the scriptures, if he should ever see cause to rescind the use he has made of that judgment, it will undoubtedly raise a query in his mind, whether he may not have misunderstood other scriptures, which he believes, regard the same subject.

It seems to have been one of the principal objects which our author had in view, to make use of the book of Enoch, in a way to favor the doctrine of endless misery. The way by which he renders this writer useful to his argument is by showing from a number of quotations from his book, that he believed and fully expressed this doctrine; which fact he contends, goes to prove that *the Jews in* our Savior's time were of the

same opinion. This fact he relies on as good evidence that Jesus and his apostles believed, on this subject, as Enoch and the Jews generally did, as neither Jesus nor his apostles ever, in a clear and distinct manner, disclaimed this sentiment. He seems to think, though he does not speak without doubt, that Enoch wrote in the last half of the first century of the christian era; and that therefore, his opinions should be considered to be the same with the general views of the people of his time; that is of the Jews of his time, as he was a Jew. I believe I have here clearly stated the substance of his argument, as it respects the book of Enoch. Having presented his readers with this argument, in due form, he proceeds as follows: 'I may be permitted then, to ask once more, Why did not Jesus and his disciples, who must have known what the common belief was, in case they deemed it to be erroneous—why did they not correct it? As honest and upright, and simple-hearted teachers, would they not have done so? We are entitled to put this last question, for no subject which can come before the human mind is more agitating or more deeply interesting than that which re

spects the duration of future misery. If Jesus and his disciples actually knew that all men will finally be saved, how can we deem it probable that they should not have written this in characters of light, or spoken it in a voice that would echo round the earth? Of all possible messages, this would have been one of the deepest concern to the hopes of our perishing race.' Judging from such language and elegant pathos, there is no room to doubt, that when our author used them he used them with the greatest confidence, and with the fullest conviction that the strength of his argument was therein expressed. To neglect therefore, duly to notice these questions and these arguments, would by no means correspond with the consideration they demand. But in the first place, it is well to notice the fact, that our author is evidently in some doubt as it respects the time in which the book of Enoch was written. He deems it *probable* that it was written at the time he mentioned. But suppose it was not. Suppose it was written long since that early date. Then what becomes of the whole superstructure which he has built on this book? I *know not* but he is right in the time he has

suggested as *probable;* and he does not know for certainty that he is. How then, can he, with so much apparent confidence, draw such momentous, and even tremendous inferences from this book as he has? He allows that his subject is of such a magnitude, that no other, *which can be brought before the human mind is more agitating or more deeply interesting*. I would then ask, whether we can, with safety, allow such a subject to be decided on ground of mere *probability?*

In respect to the opinions entertained by the Jews in our Savior's time, we are fully certified that in relation to a future state they greatly differed. The Sadducees believed in no such state. Of course they must be wholly excepted from our author's representation of the opinion of the Jews at that time. As to the belief of the Pharisees concerning a resurrection, we have good authority for believing that they excluded all but Israelites from it. But even if it were true, as it evidently is not, that both Pharisees and Sadducees believed every word of what our author has quoted from the book of Enoch, it does not appear how this fact would go to

prove that Jesus and his disciples believed the same; but, contrary to his argument, it would have a strong bearing the other way; for our Savior cautioned his disciples to beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. In view of this fact does not our author's argument utterly fail? Has he not, indeed, endeavored to prove what makes directly against him? It should here be duly noticed that our author contends that the subject of future punishment is of the utmost importance. I ask then, if Jesus believed as his enemies did in a matter paramount to all other subjects, even if he differed from them on minor points, would he have been so careful to caution his disciples to beware of their doctrine, without describing some of those minor points in particular? It can hardly be believed that our doctors of divinity would do thus. If a man will now solemnly avow his belief in the doctrine of endless misery, would he not be respectfully regarded by our author?

There is another question not yet considered, nor does it appear that our author thought of it, in regard to the sentiment

which he has found in the book of Enoch, which is this: From what authority did he learn such a doctrine? If he found it in the inspired writings of Moses and the prophets, why cannot we find it there? And if we could, would it still be necessary for us to bring his writings now to prove it? I am well satisfied that this doctrine of endless misery was never learned from the above named divine authority; and if it was not, then, doubtless, it had its origin in heathen superstitions; and who can believe that Jesus adopted heathen doctrine, not found in the sacred scriptures, which he said could not be broken? It appears to me, that standing in the light which now shines on our subject, the argument of our author must appear entirely inefficient for the purpose he intended it.

It does not now remain necessary to show good reason why Jesus and his disciples did not distinctly disavow the doctrine held by their enemies, for this our Savior did, and warned his disciples to beware of it. He called it *leaven*; and if it were what our author *supposes* it was, it was of a most pernicious kind. Never was there a doctrin

which more dishonored our Creator; never was there one more repugnant to the best and holiest desires of the human heart.

But our author insists with great solemnity, that the question should be considered, Why Jesus and his disciples did not, either write *in characters of light, or speak in a voice that would echo round the earth*, the doctrine of the salvation of all men, if they knew it to be true? Was he aware that by insisting on this, he was calling on those who enjoy a belief in this doctrine to a work in which they take the greatest delight? There is but one difficulty which here presents itself, and that is a want of both time and room to do but a small part of what might be done. As Jesus said, *I am not come to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill*, we may infer that he came to preach the doctrine which the prophets did, and finally to accomplish their predictions. The reader will now perceive that all we have to do is to show that the prophets testified the doctrine of the salvation of all men, and that Jesus and his disciples did the same. But we have neither time nor room to cite all we find which is

direct to this momentous truth. We must, therefore, only give a few as samples. Isaiah says, ch. xxv: 'And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow; of wines on the lees well refined. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth; for the Lord hath spoken it.' Can language express the doctrine of the salvation of all men more fully? Is not this *written in characters of light?* Is not this a *voice that will echo round the earth?* It is the voice of God. This is only one of many passages which are clearly expressive of the same divine sentiment. Ch. lvii. 16, 'For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth; for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made.' Lam. iii. 31—33. 'For the Lord will not cast off *forever; but* though he cause grief, yet will *he have* compassion according to the multi-

tude of his mercies. For he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men.' There is nothing obscure, nothing equivocal in this manner of expressing the divine favor towards all men. If these characters are not characters of light, I certainly misjudge. Jesus said, 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.' He also said, 'And him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out.' Is not this *written in characters of light?* Is not this *a voice which will echo round the earth?* Our author contends for the endless misery of sinners, and who of all the human race, were ever more of this description than were those who rejected, with the deepest scorn, and murdered the Lord of glory? Yet for these did Jesus pray when on the cross, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' And he expressly said, that his Father always heard him. How does this *voice* sound? Will it not sound round the earth? Who can hear it and not fall before it? Who can hear it, and not melt beneath its sound? I marvel if our author could ask for a *sound louder* or sweeter than this. When I first *cast my* eye on his call for a voice that

would *echo round the world*, I was struck with surprise, that this voice was by him unthought of.

By all the advocates of endless misery it is contended that this misery awaits none but the wicked; it is the sinner, and the sinner only that is thus to be doomed. But if this be true, who did the Savior come to save? He said he did not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. St. Paul says, 'This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief.' When the apostle spoke of sinners, he recorded himself as one of them; but when our advocates of endless misery speak of the wicked, they speak as if they themselves do not belong to that class. If it was the design of our heavenly Father in sending his Son into the world, that he should not condemn the world, but save it, is it reasonable to argue that he will not save sinners? For all had sinned. Now if it is true that the wicked, and they only are the subjects of salvation, have we not reason to hope that what renders salvation necessary will no

prevent it? Is not this divinely benevolent plan of grace written sufficiently plain in the New Testament? Is it not proclaimed in a voice sufficiently loud?

The doctrine which Jesus taught is the direct opposite of the doctrine of endless punishment, the two can never be reconciled to each other. That which Jesus taught renders good for evil; teaches us to love our enemies, to do them good, and to pray for them. It teaches to overcome evil with good; and forbids the rendering of evil for evil. The doctrine of endless punishment renders evil for evil, and withholds all good from the punished, and allows no love to be exercised towards them. The doctrine of Jesus is thus expressed, Matt. v. 43—48. 'Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just

and on the unjust. For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others, do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven, is perfect.' Surely this is as direct a denial of that doctrine which teaches that God will endlessly render to men evil for their evil deeds, as language can express. There is no room for mistake here. If we contend that God will endlessly administer evil to those who have done evil, and good to those who have loved him, we bring him to the grade of the publican! The doctrine which Jesus has given us, in the passage just quoted, gives us in the clearest manner, the unchangeable character of our Father in heaven, whose tender mercies are over all his works.

As our author evidently thinks that if the doctrine of the salvation of all men be true, it is not so plainly expressed in the scriptures as the importance of the subject would require, it may be well to examine and see how plainly it is expressed, and then as

whether it could have been expressed more clearly? In addition to those passages which have already been cited, which clearly and fully express this doctrine, we will here notice several more. To the Ephesians St. Paul says, 'that God had made known the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him.' And then he assures us that God 'worketh all things after the council of his own will.' This same apostle also says, 'If any man be in Christ he is a new creature; old things are passed away, and behold, all things are become new.' I know not how he could have written the sentiment of universal salvation more plainly. He also stated to Timothy that God 'will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.' And that pursuant to this will, the one mediator, the man Christ Jesus, gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time; and then adds, 'Whereunto I am ordained a preacher.' That the rays of light may be here

more concentrated, if possible, let us place his testimony that God worketh all things after the council of his own will, with this declaration, that God will have all men to be saved, and then ask how it is possible for words to express the doctrine of the salvation of all men more fully or more plainly? Those who now profess to believe in the salvation of all men, do never attempt to express this belief in plainer words. Let this voice *echo round the earth*, and let its testimony be by all believed, and then who will plead in defence of endless misery? With what has been just quoted from St. Paul, let us place the following from John, recorded in Revelations: 'And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels, round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders, and the number was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and *under the earth*, and such as are in the sea, *and all that* are in them, heard I saying

blessing, and honor, and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the lamb forever and ever." ' In his controversy with Dr. Channing, our author quoted this passage to prove that *spiritual and divine* worship is rendered to Christ. And with this fact we will also quote what he says on the same subject, which follows: 'Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common paraphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers, for the universe. This statement he made in respect to the following passage which he quoted. 'Phillip. ii. 10, 11: 'That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' Taking these passages of scripture in due connection, and allowing our author's own argument, founded on them, to be sound, it does not appear even possible to express the belief against which he now writes in a plainer or fuller manner. He now says, by way of question, 'Why, *then, have* those holy teachers failed to make *explicit* declarations, which admit of no doubt

and no misinterpretation, in regard to this matter?' I reply here by saying, if Christ and his apostles have failed of making the declarations which our author describes, my belief is, that it was not in their power to do it. And I am confident that no believer, preacher, or defender of the doctrine of the final subjection of all men to God, through Christ, ever has stated this belief in more explicit or unequivocal language. No man has ever spoken or written more explicitly in avowing this declaration than have the inspired writers. And yet our author says, 'If I am told, as I may be by some, that they have made such declarations, my answer is, that after making the scriptures the principal object of my study through most of my life, I have not been able to find them, I have sought for them with great solicitude. In one sense I can say truly, that I have hoped to find them.' Unhappy disappointment! As I cannot express the heart-felt gratitude which I feel for the discovery of these declarations, which our author says he has sought with great solicitude, and hoped to find, *but found* them not; so I feel a sincere pity and sorrow of heart for one who

has hitherto sought unsuccessfully to fi
such a treasure.

There is a large part of the article whi
I am noticing, which has reference to t
want of learning, which the writer, with l
tle moderation, notices in the writings of thc
whose error he is endeavoring to corre
and also not a little to prove that those scri
tures which some have used to prove a fir
deliverance from the torments of hell, in t
future or invisible world, are not sufficie
to prove such a doctrine. This part of l
labors I shall pass by, or take notice of b
one or two particulars found in it. I m
be permitted just to say, that in a commu
ty which is as enlightened as the one in whi
we live; and a community so much given
reading on all subjects, and so much dispos
to understand things for themselves, the
seems but little danger that the stupidly i
norant and unlearned will be able to le
many into very palpable or pernicious do
trines; and that it need give our learned pr
fessors little concern, even should such do
trines find a few such advocates engaged
their support. The greater danger is, t

errors, which have acquired a sort of sanctity by having been long embraced in the creeds of the church, will continue to exert an unfavorable influence, and that unperceived, in the minds of our best scholars.

It really seems a matter exciting pity, that our learned author should ever have been so unfortunate as to meet with any thing, to him so offensive and disgusting, as he has complained of in the following language: 'The attempts at *philology* which some of our fellow citizens of the class named, often exhibit; the show of learning, the parade of αιων and עולם, and of declarations respecting those which show that the mere elements of critical study are not mastered; the descants on the foreign languages of Greek and Hebrew, by those to whom they are still altogether *foreign*, may provoke the smile, or the disgust of one who has studied those languages, more thoroughly, but they can make but little progress towards *convincing* him.

When will men learn that reason and not noise, *that* science and not ignorance, that pa-

tient and protracted investigation and not hasty and *a priori* assertion, are the appropriate means of convincing and winning over their fellow men?' There is also more of this disgusting subject, of which our author complains, which he has given to his readers, but I omit it. In reference to what is here complained of, I remark, 1st. If the defenders of universal salvation are so unlearned and so grossly ignorant as to disgust the learned Professor, does it not seem rather strange that he should manifest so much concern for fear this doctrine, so miserably defended, may, in defiance of all the profound learning and knowledge which are arrayed against it, go on in its course, laying prostrate all opposition? 2d. Can any sober, candid christian avoid regretting that our author should pretend that the Hebrew and Greek words above noticed, necessarily mean endless duration when applied to punishment?

Although enough has been written and published in regard to the Hebrew word עלם and the Greek word αιων to settle forever the *fact, that* the endless duration of punishment *cannot be* proved by these words; yet as

they are still used, by our learned doctors for this purpose, the reader will not deem it out of place, or improper, that several quotations from Lexicons are here put down. In his Hebrew Lexicon, Parkhurst says, עלם or עולם are used both as nouns and adverbs, for *time hidden or concealed from man*, as well indefinite, (Gen. xvii. 8. 1 Sam. xiii. 13. 2 Sam. xii. 10,) and eternal (Gen. iii. 22. Ps. ix. 8,) as finite (Ex. xxi. 6. 1 Sam. i. 22. com. ver. 28. 1 Sam. xxvii. 12.) as well past (Gen. vi. 4. Deut. xxxii. 7. Josh. xxiv. 2. Ps. xli. 13. Prov. viii. 23.) as future. It seems to be much more frequently used for indefinite than for infinite time. Sometimes it seems particularly to denote the continuance of the *Jewish* dispensation or age. Gen. xvii. 13. Ex. xii. 14, 24. xxvii. 21, and al. freq, and sometimes the period of time to the *jubilee*, which was an eminent type of the completion of the Jewish and typical dispensation, by the coming and death of Christ. See Levit. xxv. 9, &c.

On the Greek word αιων, which in meaning corresponds with the Hebrew עלם, the same Lexicographer says, 'An age, period,

periodical dispensation of divine providence. In Matt. xxiv. 3, it evidently refers to the *Jewish age, or age under the Mosaic law.* (See Whitby, Dodridge, and Macknight on that text.) But in Matt. xxviii. 20, it seems plainly to denote the *age under the Messiah,* for *Christ* had just before declared that all *power was given unto him both in heaven and in earth.* Compare Acts ii. 33—36; and for this use of αιων see Matt. xii. 32. 1 Cor. x. 11. (Where consult Bp. Pearce) &c. Again he says, 'αιων in the LXX. generally answers to the Hebrew עולם, which denotes *time hidden* from man, whether indefinite or definite, whether past or future.'

It has long been acknowledged that not the natural force of these words, but the nature of the subject to which they are applied, must determine their true meaning, as they are used in the sacred writings. With this acknowledged rule before us, it is easy to see that from some circumstance, aside from the force of those words, punishment must be shown to be endless, or not shown at all. *Now, if* we are careful to notice that the word *punish* and the word *chastise* are in scripture

used as synonymous, see Levit. xxvi. 18 and 28, we shall see that endless punishment or chastisement is absurd. See Heb. xii. 6. 'For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth.' Now we are willing to allow that God will punish or chastise his creatures as much and as long as his love towards them will dictate, but no more nor any longer.

In regard to a deliverance from the torments of hell, and of a restoration therefrom, against which our author endeavors to labor, he asks the following question: 'Cannot divine justice render the sinner miserable so long as he continues to be a sinner, i. e. so long as he remains impenitent?' Respecting this question, I would inquire how it so happens that our authors, who disagree respecting a final deliverance from a state of punishment hereafter, do none of them attempt to prove that men will commit sin in the hereafter state? It is apparent from our author's question, above cited, that he does not contend for the continuance of misery hereafter any longer than the miserable continue sinners. Now it will be conceded by all, *that so long as* any moral being continues

sin, so long that being must, of necessity, be miserable. Why not, then, in room of laboring to prove that some will be endlessly punished, direct the argument so as to prove that some will continue to sin endlessly? If sin be the just cause of punishment, and the continuance of it, the just cause of the continuance of punishment, to prove that such punishment will be absolutely endless, it is only necessary to prove from divine authority that men will endlessly continue to sin. Against the endless continuance of sin there are some passages of scripture which may be quoted. See Dan. ix. 29, 'Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness.' John i. 24. 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' 1 John ii. 1, 2, 'And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.' These and many more passages seem to favor the hope that sin will not continue endlessly.

That I may not extend this article to too great a length, I will notice but one subject more; and that is one in which our author gives his readers to know that he does not disregard the intense yearnings of those fond and kind affections, which our Creator has given us; and that he himself is not destitute of them. He seems fully sensible that the doctrine, for which he contends, finds in those compassions, of which we are all possessed, its most unyielding opposition. He speaks freely of the repulsive, revolting character of the idea of endless misery, when these kind affections are compelled to contemplate it. And when he comes to his conclusion, he endeavors to administer comfort in regard to the troubles, apprehensions, and swelling sorrows, which so deeply struggle in the human breast against this most tremendous doctrine. I am glad that he is sensible of this whole circumstance; but I cannot but marvel that he should entertain any expectation of overcoming its opposition to his doctrine, or that he should even desire to do it. He says, 'That the subject is one of fearful interest, none will deny, who believe in *future retribution*. That there are difficul

ties pressed by it on the mind, when any
thinks of his own condition, that of his
loved friends, or of his brethren of the hu
race, it would be mere pretence to deny.
it is a consolation to believe, that behind
clouds, however dark, that interpose betw
us and the light of the sun, his beams
shine clearly. All will be clear in the l
of heaven. If parents, husbands, wi
brothers, sisters, must see those dear as t
own life, perish at last, while they th
selves are saved, heaven in mercy will ei
extinguish their susceptibilities, or else
them such a sweet and overpowering s
of the justice and goodness of God, as s
not permit the joys of the blessed to be ir
rupted with sighs of sympathetic sor
How this will or can be done, we may n
know in the present world; nay, we
have many a distressing hour, while inq
ing how it can possibly be done, unless
very nature itself is wholly changed.
the light of eternity will scatter these dou
and clear and uninterrupted vision of di
glory will fill the soul *with all the fullnes*
God; so that the blessed above will
their perfect happiness in thinking and

ing as He does, into whose image they have been transformed.' If our author had entirely succeeded in every argument which he had undertaken before, he would have left his subject in utter darkness, by offering what is above quoted. In reference to this, I would first inquire, whether Jesus or any of his apostles, or any inspired writers have left any intimations that the doctrine they held up was attended with these difficulties, which he acknowledges his doctrine unavoidably presses on the human mind? Did he ever think of this question? How could he, when writing as he has, keep out of his thoughts the appeal which Jesus made to compassionate susceptibilities of parents, who, though they were evil, knew how to give good gifts to their children? Surely Jesus never gave any one to understand, that in order to receive his doctrine in their hearts, they must submit to live all the days of their lives struggling against the kind affections which the Creator had implanted within them. I would again ask, how are we to account for the fact, that Jesus in view of the temporal *calamities* which he foresaw were coming *on Jerusalem*, was seen to weep over the *city; and* yet that we have no account of h

shedding one tear, or uttering a single sigh on account of those endless torments which our author allows are naturally calculated to press our minds with such anguish? When Jesus saw the many women weeping for him, and following him when he was going to the place of his execution, he seemed to have felt more for them than for himself, and told them, not to weep for him, but for themselves and their children. But did he tell them thus to weep on account of this hereafter endless misery, for which our author contends? No: but he referred them to the temporal sufferings which would be endured, when the enemies of the Jews should shut them up in their city, and keep them in on every side. We are fully assured, that Jesus had sorrows and tears on account of people's sufferings in this world; but no intimations that he had any sorrows or apprehensions on account of what they were to suffer in the eternal state.

I wish to inquire, in the next place, from what authority our author feels himself authorized to suggest such means, as he has, by which fathers, mothers, wives, brothers, and sisters are to be quieted in heaven, and

rejoice, without a sigh, when they see such dear relations in endless wo? I bless God and adore him, I rejoice with inexpressible joy, that it is not He, but imperfect, erring man, who imposes on community such soul-trying doctrines; yet I cannot but grieve, that God should be so dishonored.

But it did not occur to our author, that even if he should, by his own contrivance, and without any assistance from the scriptures, succeed in giving a probable account of the means by which the compassionate affections of our nature will be so overcome, or taken away, that the endless torments of those who are to suffer in hell, will cause no sorrow to those in heaven, he would, after all, leave a greater difficulty unremoved, and untouched. There are the tender mercies of an unchangable God, which divine inspiration assures us are over all his works, which still remain more opposed to his doctrine, than our most ardent affections can be. What is to be done in this case? Our author only endeavors to dry up those small streams of *loving kindness* in us, that he may get along *with his doctrine*, to which he acknowledge *they are never to be reconciled in this*

but he seems not even to have thought of the boundless Fountain, from which all these streams flow! Surely this defender of the doctrine of endless, unmerciful punishment, has not even begun his work. Who on earth would think of preventing the flowing of a stream, while its fountain continued full and to overflow? The love of God, that great love wherewith he loved us while we were dead in sin, has been manifested through his Son, and by his death for his enemies was commended to us. By what means this love is to be brought into friendship with the doctrine of endless misery, our author has got yet to show. Until he does this, he will have done nothing favorable to his scheme.

In bringing this examination to a close, I would say, that if any expression has escaped my pen which indicates any want of respect for Professor Stuart, towards whom I cherish the best of feelings, I beg that on such the most charitable construction may be put.